

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

October 23, 2018

Steve Kemp  
TLC Engineering for Architecture  
Creeside Crossing 1, 12 Cadillac Dr. Ste. 150  
Brentwood, TN 37027  
Re: **RFQ # 1033925, MEP Engineering Services**

Dear Mr. Kemp:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1033925 for MEP Engineering Services. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to TLC Engineering for Architecture, contingent upon successful contract negotiations. Please provide a certificate of Insurance indicating all applicable coverages within 15 business days of the receipt of this letter.

If the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements were a part of this solicitation, the awardee must forward a signed copy of the "Letter of Intent to Perform as Subcontractor/Subconsultant/Supplier/Joint Venture" for any minority/women-owned business enterprises included in the response to the Business Assistance Office within two business days from this notification.

Additionally the awardee will be required to submit evidence of participation of and contractor's payment to all Small, Minority, and Women Owned Businesses participation in any resultant contract. This evidence shall be submitted monthly and include copies of subcontracts or purchase orders, the Prime Contractor's Application for Payment, or invoices, and cancelled checks or other supporting payment documents. Should you have any questions concerning this requirement, please contact Tina Burt, BAO Representative, at 615-880-2783 or at [tina.burt@nashville.gov](mailto:tina.burt@nashville.gov).

Depending on the file sizes, the responses to the procurement solicitation and supporting award documentation can be made available either by email, CD for pickup, or in person for inspection. If you desire to receive or review the documentation or have any questions, please contact Christina Alexander by email at [christina.alexander@nashville.gov](mailto:christina.alexander@nashville.gov) Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

Thank you for participating in Metro's competitive procurement process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Michelle A. Hernandez Lane".

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane  
Purchasing Agent

Cc: Solicitation File, Other Offerors

**Pursuant to M.C.L. 4.36.010 Authority to resolve protested solicitations and awards.**

**A. Right to Protest.** Any actual or prospective bidder, offeror or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the Purchasing Agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

Procurement Division

730 Second Avenue South, Suite 112  
P.O. Box 196300  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219-6300

[www.Nashville.gov](http://www.Nashville.gov)  
Phone: 615-862-6180  
Fax: 615-862-6179





# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

## Request for Mayoral Selection of A&E Firm RFQ 1033925, MEP Engineering Services

Metro received 8 proposals for the A&E Review Board to consider. The Review Board submits for review and selection by the Mayor the top 5 evaluated firms listed below in alphabetical order, accompanied by the Review Board's summary.

While it is acknowledged that the selection is solely that of the Mayor, it is the Review Board's recommendation that **Envision Advantage LLC, I C Thomasson Associates Inc., Pinnacle Engineering PLLC and TLC Engineering for Architecture, and TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.** be considered for this project.

**A&E Firm:** **Envision Advantage LLC**

**Strengths:** Firm provided an organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm provided detailed description of tasks, a proposed checklist, to include a plan for tracking the project budget. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project, which included creating an Owner's Project Requirements tracking system. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation.

**Weaknesses:** Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm failed to provide requested contact information for listed reference projects. Firm failed to provide the schedule duration and the project budget information for the listed reference projects. Firm failed to provide a detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm lacked detail in describing firm's approach to the ability to work as a team with Metro.

**MWBE Plan:** Proposed the engagement of Win Engineering (WBE), and GHP Environmental & Architecture (WBE).

**SBE/SDV Plan:** Pledged 20% SBE participation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed engagement of SBE subcontractors: EMC Structural Engineers PC, Ingram Civil Engineering Group LLC and Facility Diagnostics.



**A&E Firm:** I C Thomasson Associates Inc.

**Strengths:** Firm provided an organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm acknowledged potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan log for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverables for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years.

**Weaknesses:** Firm failed to provide schedule duration and original schedule for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide original and final cost for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide firm's policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices.

**MWBE Plan:** Proposed the engagement of DF & H Services (WBE), Arora Engineers Inc. (MBE), Artifice LLC (WBE), Logan Patri Engineering Inc. (MBE), and Connico Incorporated (WBE).

**SBE/SDV Plan:** Pledged 20% SBE participation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed engagement of SBE subcontractors: DF & H Services, Artifice LLC, Logan Patri Engineering Inc., and Connico Incorporated.

**A&E Firm:** Pinnacle Engineering PLLC

**Strengths:** Firm provided an organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project to include cost estimators. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to



performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include check points for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverables for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years. Firm provided detailed information for reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity.

Weaknesses: Firm lacked detail in describing firm's approach to the ability to work as a team with Metro.

MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of PDR Engineers Inc. (MBE), Logan Patri Engineering Inc. (MBE), and Melvin Gill & Associates (MBE).

SBE/SDV Plan: Pledged 20% SBE participation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed engagement of SBE subcontractors: PDR Engineers Inc., Puckett Engineering PLLC, Logan Patri Engineering Inc., and Melvin Gill & Associates.

**A&E Firm: TLC Engineering for Architecture.**

Strengths: Firm demonstrated its organizational roles for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined role responsibilities for scope of work for this solicitation. Firm described innovative solutions for the scope of work in this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include the use of SKM software for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverables for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation.

Weaknesses: Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm lacked details in proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm failed to provide a detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm failed to provide contact information for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed schedule and actual completion for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed cost and actual cost for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide list of Metro projects for past 5 years.

MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of Yad Consulting LLC (WBE), and TRC Construction Services (MBE).

*Review Board's Summary Follows*

*CPS*



SBE/SDV Plan: Pledged 20% SBE participation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed engagement of SBE subcontractor: Yad Consulting LLC.

**A&E Firm:** TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.

**Strengths:** Firm demonstrated its organizational roles for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined team responsibilities for scope of work for this solicitation. Firm described innovative solutions for the scope of work in this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include the use of SKM software for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverables for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation.

**Weaknesses:** Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm lacked details in proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm failed to provide a detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm failed to provide contact information for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed schedule and actual completion for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed cost and actual cost for non-Metro reference projects. Firm failed to provide list of Metro projects for past 5 years.

**MWBE Plan:** Proposed the engagement of Yad Consulting LLC (WBE), and TRC Construction Services (MBE).

**SBE/SDV Plan:** Pledged 20% SBE participation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed engagement of SBE subcontractor: Yad Consulting LLC.



## RFQ# 1033925 MEP Engineering Services Review Board Score Sheet

Offeror	Envision Advantage LLC	I C Thomasson Associates Inc.	Live Oak Company	Pinnacle Engineering Inc.	Puckett Engineering PLLC	TLC Engineering for Architecture	TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.
Contract Acceptance Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ISA Questionnaire Completed Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Buisness Plan and Methodology (45)	44.00	43.00	25.00	45.00	35.00	41.00	41.00
Qualifications & Experience (35)	32.00	32.00	28.00	35.00	32.00	34.00	30.00
Project Approach & Process (15)	14.00	15.00	9.00	13.00	10.00	14.00	13.00
SBE/SDV Business Plan (5)	1.50	4.75	0.50	1.25	1.75	0.75	1.25
<b>Total Evaluation Scores</b>	<b>91.50</b>	<b>94.75</b>	<b>62.50</b>	<b>94.25</b>	<b>78.75</b>	<b>89.75</b>	<b>85.25</b>

### Evaluation Comments

Envision Advantage LLC
<b>Strengths</b>
Firm provided organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm provided detailed description of tasks, a proposed checklist, to include a plan for tracking the project budget. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project, which included creating an Owner's Project Requirements tracking system. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation.
<b>Weaknesses</b>
Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm failed to provide requested contact information for listed reference projects. Firm failed to provide the schedule duration and the project budget information for the listed reference projects. Firm failed to provide a detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm lacked detail in describing firm's approach to the ability to work as a team with Metro.



### **I C Thomasson Associates Inc.**

#### **Strengths**

Firm provided organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm acknowledged potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan log for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm failed to provide schedule duration and original schedule for non-Metro reference project. Firm failed to provide original and final costs for non-Metro reference project. Firm failed to provide firm's policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices.

### **Live Oak Company**

#### **Strengths**

Firm provided detailed understanding for scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm failed to demonstrate firm's organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm failed to provide a defined team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm failed to describe a innovative or progressive approach for this project. Firm failed to provide a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm failed to identify potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and a proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm failed to identify approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm failed to provide detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm failed to provide detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm failed to provide detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation.



### **Pinnacle Engineering Inc.**

#### **Strengths**

Firm provided organizational structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm described a progressive approach to be implemented for this project to include cost estimators. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed a mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include check points for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years. Firm provided detailed information for reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm lacked detail in describing firm's approach to the ability to work as a team with Metro.

### **Puckett Engineering PLLC**

#### **Strengths**

Firm provided an organizational structure to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided proposed team structure to include role responsibilities. Firm provided a work plan to include mode of notifications. Firm provided a detailed approach for quality control with an explanation of firm implemented standards. Firm provided detailed information for non-Metro reference projects. Firm provided list of Metro projects worked on in the last 5 years.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm lacked details in describing a innovative or progressive approach for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm lacked details in demonstrating knowledge of scope of work for this solicitation. Firm lacked details in provided approach for drawings and specifications preparations. Firm lacked details for proposed potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm lacked details in approach to minimize disruptions to performance and in proposed comprehensive plan for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm lacked details in on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation.



### **TLC Engineering for Architecture**

#### **Strengths**

Firm demonstrated its organization structure for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined proposed team structure to include defined responsibilities. Firm described innovative design approach for the scope of work in this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include staffing, organization, communication and quality control and quality assurance. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include check points for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation. Firm provided a list of Metro projects for past 5 years. Firm provided detailed information for reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm lacked details for proposed potential challenges and risks associated with the scope of work for this solicitation and proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm failed to provide original proposed amount and final cost for non-Metro reference projects listed. Firm lacked details in approach for consulting, investigating, analyzing, testing, evaluating and maintaining Metro facilities.

### **TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.**

#### **Strengths**

Firm demonstrated its organizational roles for providing services requested in the scope of work for this solicitation to include proposed subconsultants. Firm provided defined responsibilities for scope of work for this solicitation. Firm described innovative solutions for the scope of work in this solicitation. Firm provided a detailed work plan with an overall approach for the scope of work for this solicitation to include organization, communication and quality control. Firm identified approach to minimize disruptions to performance with a proposed comprehensive plan to include the use of SKM software for the scope of work for this solicitation. Firm provided detailed information on how the firm would ensure successful deliverable for each project resulting from this solicitation. Firm provided detailed approach for specifications and drawing preparation.

#### **Weaknesses**

Firm failed to place requested information in appropriate evaluation criteria section as described in instructions. Firm lacked details in proposed mitigation plan for challenges and risks. Firm failed to provide detailed explanation of understanding that proposed key staff shall be assigned to all Metro projects resulting from this solicitation. Firm failed to provide contact information for reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed schedule and actual completion for reference projects. Firm failed to provide proposed cost and actual cost for reference projects. Firm failed to provide list of Metro projects for past 5 years.



Proposer #	Commitment to SBE/SDV Participation on the project (2pts)	Strategic Approach to maximizing SBE/SDV (2 pts)	Monitoring and Reporting of SBE/SDV participation (.50 pts)	Efforts ensure prompt payment (.50pts)	Total	Strength	Weakness
Envision Advantage	0.5	0.25	0.5	0.5	1.75		Failed to provide information on SBE/SDV participation on past projects. Plan lacking details regarding strategic approaches and methodologies.
Harms Engineering	0	0	0	0	0		No SBE/SDV plan provided.
I. C. Thomasson Associates	2	2	0.5	0.25	4.75	Expressed commitment to SBE/SDV participation, provided detailed information on past performance of the utilization of SBE/SDVs, monitoring and reporting of SBE/SDV participation, and identified potential SBE/SDV subcontractors.	
Live Oak Company	0.5	0	0	0	0.5		Overall plan lacked details for requested components.
Pinnacle Engineering	1	0	0.25	0	1.25		Failed to provide information on SBE/SDV participation on past projects. Plan lacking details regarding strategic approaches and methodologies and prompt payment.
Puckett Engineering	1	0	0.5	0.25	1.75		Failed to provide information on SBE/SDV participation on past projects. Plan lacking details regarding strategic approaches and methodologies and prompt payment.
TLC Engineering for Architecture	0.5	0	0.25	0	0.75		Failed to provide information on SBE/SDV participation on past projects. Plan lacking details regarding, strategic approaches and methodologies, monitoring and reporting tactics, and prompt payment.
TRC Worldwide Engineering	1	0	0.25	0	1.25		Plan lacking details regarding strategic approaches and methodologies, monitoringand reporting tactics and prompt payment.





## METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

July 20, 2018

Mr. Tim Harms  
Harms Engineering, Inc.  
850 Neartop Drive  
Nashville, TN 37205  
[harmsengr@gmail.com](mailto:harmsengr@gmail.com)

SENT VIA EMAIL

### **RFQ 1033925 Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing – MEP Engineering Services**

Mr. Harms:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County has completed its evaluation of submitted responses to the above solicitation and unfortunately, has determined that your submission was non-responsive to the solicitation requirements.

Specifically, the submitted proposal was non-responsive due to a failure to comply with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements –outreach to at least three potential certified MWBE firms. Outreach was conducted to only two certified MWBE firms.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Michelle A. Hernandez Lane".

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane  
Chief Procurement/Purchasing Agent  
Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County

Cc: Solicitation Files



**BAO SBE Assessment Sheet**

**BAO Specialist:** Tina R. Burt

**Contract Specialist:** Genario Pittman

**Date:** 06/20/2018

**Department Name:** General Services

**RFP/ITB Number:** 1033925

**Project Name:** Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) Engineering Services (A&E)

Primary Contractor	SBEs Approved?	Comments
Envision Advantage, LLC	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer is an approved SBE firm and acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms EMC Structural Engineers, P. C. for Structural Engineering, Ingram Civil Engineering Group, LLC for Civil Engineering, and Facility Diagnostics, LLC for Commissioning.
I. C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms DF& H Services for Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, ARTifice, LLC for Architecture, Logan Patri Engineering Inc. for Structural Engineering, Connico Inc. for Scheduling/Estimating.
Pinnacle Engineering, Inc.	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer is an approved SBE firm and acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms Planning Design Research Engineers, Inc. for Environmental & Civil Engineering, Puckett Engineering, PLLC for Electrical Engineering, Logan Patri Engineering, Inc. for Structural Engineering, and Melvin Gill & Associates for Architecture.
TLC Engineering for Architecture	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of Win Engineering, LLC for Electrical.
TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc.	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms



# PNP Compliance Results Form

Department Name: General Services

RFP/ITB Number: 1033925

Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) Engineering Services (A&E)

Primary Contractor	PNP Compliant (Yes/No)	Determination Comments/% of Participation Proposed or Bid
Envision Advantage, LLC	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to three certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Win Engineering (WBE) - Accepted, Gobbell Hayes Partners, Inc. (WBE) - Accepted and I/S Engineering & Utilities, Inc. (WBE) - Declined. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
I. C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to five certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of DF&H Services (WBE) - Accepted, Arora Engineers (MBE) - Accepted, Artifice LLC (WBE) - Accepted, Logan Patri Engineering, Inc. (MBE) - Accepted, and Connico, Inc. (WBE) - Accepted. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
Pinnacle Engineering, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to three certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Planning Design & Research Engineers, Inc. (MBE) - Accepted, Logan Patri Engineering, Inc. (MBE) - Accepted and Melvin Gill & Associates (MBE) - Accepted. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
TLC Engineering for Architecture	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to three certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Gould Turner Group (WBE) - Accepted, Win Engineering, Inc. (WBE) - Accepted, Specs & Details (WBE) - Declined. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to three certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of TRC Construction Services (MBE) - Accepted, Yad Consulting (MBE) - Accepted, and K. S. Ware & Associates (WBE) - Declined. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.

\*Denotes Contractor with whom follow up was required  
Date: 06/11/2018  
Metro Buyer: Christina Alexander BAO Rep: Tina R. Burt